

# Functions with Pick matrices having bounded number of negative eigenvalues

V. Bolotnikov, A. Kheifets and L. Rodman

## Abstract

A class is studied of complex valued functions defined on the unit disk (with a possible exception of a discrete set) with the property that all their Pick matrices have not more than a prescribed number of negative eigenvalues. Functions in this class, known to appear as pseudomultipliers of the Hardy space, are characterized in several other ways. It turns out that a typical function in the class is meromorphic with a possible modification at a finite number of points, and total number of poles and of points of modification does not exceed the prescribed number of negative eigenvalues. Bounds are given for the number of points that generate Pick matrices that are needed to achieve the requisite number of negative eigenvalues. A result analogous to Hindmarsh's theorem is proved for functions in the class.

**Key Words:** Schur functions, Pick matrices.

**2000 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 30E99, 15A63.

## 1 Introduction and main results

A complex valued function  $S$  is called a *Schur function* if  $S$  is defined on the open unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$ , is analytic, and satisfies  $|S(z)| \leq 1$  for every  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ . Schur functions and their generalizations have been extensively studied in the literature. They admit various useful characterizations; one such well-known characterization is the following: *A function  $S$  defined on  $\mathbb{D}$  is a Schur function if and only the kernel*

$$K_S(z, w) = \frac{1 - S(z)S(w)^*}{1 - zw^*} \quad (1.1)$$

*is positive on  $\mathbb{D}$ .* The positivity of (1.1) on  $\mathbb{D}$  means that for every choice of positive integer  $n$  and of distinct points  $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{D}$ , the *Pick matrix*

$$P_n(S; z_1, \dots, z_n) = \left[ \frac{1 - S(z_i)S(z_j)^*}{1 - z_i z_j^*} \right]_{i,j=1}^n$$

is positive semidefinite:  $P_n(S; z_1, \dots, z_n) \geq 0$ .

The following remarkable theorem due to Hindmarsh [13] (see also [11]) implies that if all Pick matrices of order 3 are positive semidefinite, then the function is necessarily analytic.

**Theorem 1.1** *Let  $S$  be a function defined on an open set  $U \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ , and assume that  $P_3(S; z_1, z_2, z_3)$  is positive semidefinite for every choice of  $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in U$ . Then  $S$  is analytic on  $U$ , and  $|S(z)| \leq 1$  for every  $z \in U$ .*

A corollary of Theorem 1.1 will be useful; we say that a set  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{D}$  is *discrete* (in  $\mathbb{D}$ ) if  $\Lambda$  is at most countable, with accumulation points (if any) only on the boundary of  $\mathbb{D}$ .

**Corollary 1.2** *Let  $S$  be a function defined on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a discrete set. If  $P_3(S; z_1, z_2, z_3)$  is positive semidefinite for every choice of  $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , then  $S$  admits analytic continuation to a Schur function (defined on  $\mathbb{D}$ ).*

In this paper we prove, among other things, an analogue of Hindmarsh's theorem for the class of functions whose Pick matrices have a bounded number of negative eigenvalues. These functions need not be analytic, or meromorphic, on  $\mathbb{D}$ . It will be generally assumed that such functions are defined on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a discrete set, which may depend on the function. More precisely:

**Definition 1.3** *Given a nonnegative integer  $\kappa$ , the class  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$  consists of (complex valued) functions  $f$  defined on  $\text{Dom}(f) = \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda = \Lambda(f)$  is a discrete set, and such that all Pick matrices*

$$P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n) := \left[ \frac{1 - f(z_i)f(z_j)^*}{1 - z_i z_j^*} \right]_{i,j=1}^n, \quad z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda \text{ are distinct}, \quad (1.2)$$

*have at most  $\kappa$  negative eigenvalues, and at least one such Pick matrix has exactly  $\kappa$  negative eigenvalues (counted with multiplicities).*

The Pick matrices (1.2) are clearly Hermitian. Note also that in Definition 1.3 the points  $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$  are assumed to be distinct; an equivalent definition is obtained if we omit the requirement that the points  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  are distinct.

Meromorphic functions in the class  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$  have been studied before in various contexts: approximation problems [3], spectral theory of unitary operators in Pontryagin spaces [14], Schur–Takagi problem [1], Nevanlinna - Pick problem [16], [12], [7], model theory [4]. Recently, functions with jumps in  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$  appeared in the theory of almost multipliers (or pseudomultipliers) [2]; this connection will be discussed in more details later on.

Throughout the paper,  $\text{Dom}(f)$  stands for the domain of definition of  $f$  and  $Z(f)$  denotes the zero set for  $f$ :

$$Z(f) = \{z \in \text{Dom}(f) : f(z) = 0\}.$$

The number of negative eigenvalues (counted with multiplicities) of a Hermitian matrix  $P$  will be denoted by  $\text{sq}_-P$ . For a function  $f$  defined on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a discrete set, we let  $\mathbf{k}_n(f)$  to denote the maximal number of negative eigenvalues (counted with multiplicities) of all Pick matrices of order  $n$ :

$$\mathbf{k}_n(f) := \max_{z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda} \text{sq}_-P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n). \quad (1.3)$$

We also put formally  $\mathbf{k}_0(f) = 0$ . It is clear that the sequence  $\{\mathbf{k}_n(f)\}$  is non decreasing and if  $f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$ , then

$$\mathbf{k}_n(f) = \kappa \quad (1.4)$$

for all sufficiently large integers  $n$ . Note that the class  $\mathcal{S}_0$  coincides with the Schur class; more precisely, every function  $f$  in  $\mathcal{S}_0$  admits an extension to a Schur function. Here and elsewhere, we say that a function  $g$  is an *extension* of a function  $f$  if  $\text{Dom}(g) \supseteq \text{Dom}(f)$  and  $g(z) = f(z)$  for every  $z \in \text{Dom}(f)$ .

The following result by Krein - Langer [14] gives a characterization of *meromorphic* functions in  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$ .

**Theorem 1.4** *Let  $f$  be a meromorphic function on  $\mathbb{D}$ . Then  $f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$  if and only if  $f(z)$  can be represented as  $f(z) = \frac{S(z)}{B(z)}$ , where  $S$  is a Schur function and  $B$  is a Blaschke product of degree  $\kappa$  such that  $S$  and  $B$  have no common zeros.*

Recall that a *Blaschke product* (all Blaschke products in this paper are assumed to be finite) is a rational function  $B(z)$  that is analytic on  $\mathbb{D}$  and unimodular on the unit circle  $\mathbb{T}$ :  $|B(z)| = 1$  for  $|z| = 1$ ; the *degree* of  $B(z)$  is the number of zeros (counted with multiplicities) of  $B(z)$  in  $\mathbb{D}$ . See also [12], [10], [9] for various proofs of matrix and operator-valued versions of Theorem 1.4.

However, not all functions in  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$  are meromorphic, as a standard example shows:

**Example 1.5** Let the function  $f$  be defined on  $\mathbb{D}$  as  $f(z) = 1$  if  $z \neq 0$ ;  $f(0) = 0$ . Then  $P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n) = 0$  if  $z_j$ 's are all nonzero; if one of the points is zero (up to a permutation similarity we can assume that  $z_1 = 0$ ), then  $P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n)$  is the matrix with ones in the first column and in the first row and with zeroes elsewhere. This matrix clearly is of rank two and has one negative eigenvalue. Thus,  $f \in \mathcal{S}_1$ . That  $f$  has a jump discontinuity at  $z = 0$  is essential; removing the discontinuity would result in the constant function  $\tilde{f}(z) = 1$ , which does not belong to  $\mathcal{S}_1$ .

As it was shown in [2], functions in  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$  that are defined in  $\mathbb{D}$  except for a finite set of singularities, are exactly the  $\kappa$ -pseudomultipliers of the Hardy space  $H_2$  (see [2] for the definitions of pseudomultipliers and their singularities; roughly speaking, a pseudomultiplier maps a subspace of finite codimension in Hilbert space of functions

into the Hilbert space, by means of the corresponding multiplication operator). In fact, similar results were obtained in [2] for more general reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of functions. Theorem 2.1 of [2] implies in particular that every function in the class  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$  defined on a set of uniqueness of  $H_2$  can be extended to a function in  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$  defined everywhere in  $\mathbb{D}$  except for a finite number of singularities. Theorem 3.1 of [2] implies that the pseudomultipliers of  $H_2$  are meromorphic in  $\mathbb{D}$  with a finite number of poles and jumps, some of which may coincide. This result applies to other reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of analytic functions as well, as proved in [2].

For the Hardy space  $H_2$ , the pseudomultipliers can be characterized in a more concrete way, namely as standard functions defined below, see Theorem 1.7(2). This characterization is based largely on Krein - Langer theorem 1.4.

In this paper we focus on a more detailed study of the class  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$ . Our proofs depend on techniques used in interpolation, such as matrix inequalities and Schur complements, and allow us to obtain generalizations of Hindmarsh's theorem (Theorem 1.7(3)) and precise estimates of the size of Pick matrices needed to attain the required number of negative eigenvalues (Theorem 1.8).

**Definition 1.6** *A function  $f$  is said to be a standard function if it admits the representation*

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{S(z)}{B(z)} & \text{if } z \notin \mathcal{W} \cup \mathcal{Z}, \\ \gamma_j & \text{if } z = z_j \in \mathcal{Z}, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

for some complex numbers  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_\ell$ , where:

1.  $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_\ell\}$  and  $\mathcal{W} = \{w_1, \dots, w_p\}$  are disjoint sets of distinct points in  $\mathbb{D}$ ;
2.  $B(z)$  is a Blaschke product of degree  $q \geq 0$  and  $S(z)$  is a Schur function with the zero sets  $Z(B)$  and  $Z(S)$ , respectively, such that

$$\mathcal{W} \subseteq Z(B) \subseteq \mathcal{W} \cup \mathcal{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad Z(B) \cap Z(S) = \emptyset;$$

3. if  $z_j \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus Z(B)$ , then  $\frac{S(z_j)}{B(z_j)} \neq \gamma_j$ .

For the standard function  $f$  of the form (1.5),  $\text{Dom}(f) = \mathbb{D} \setminus \mathcal{W}$ . More informally,  $\mathcal{Z}$  is the set of points  $z_0$  at which  $f$  is defined and  $f(z_0) \neq \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} f(z)$ . The case when  $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} |f(z)| = \infty$  is not excluded here; in this case  $f(z_0)$  is defined nevertheless. The set  $\mathcal{W}$  consists of those poles of  $\frac{S(z)}{B(z)}$  at which  $f$  is not defined. In reference to the properties (1)-(3) in Definition 1.6 we will say that  $f(z)$  has  $q$  poles (the zeros of  $B(z)$ ), where each pole is counted according to its multiplicity as a zero of  $B(z)$ , and  $\ell$  jumps  $z_1, \dots, z_\ell$ . Note that the poles and jumps need not be disjoint.

**Theorem 1.7** *Let  $f$  be defined on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a discrete set. Fix a nonnegative integer  $\kappa$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

1.  $f$  belongs to  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$ .
2.  $f$  admits an extension to a standard function with  $\ell$  jumps (for some  $\ell$ ,  $0 \leq \ell \leq \kappa$ ) and  $\kappa - \ell$  poles, and the jumps of the standard function are contained in  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ .
- 3.

$$\mathbf{k}_n(f) = \mathbf{k}_{n+3}(f) = \kappa \quad \text{for some integer } n \geq 0. \quad (1.6)$$

Note that the extension to a standard function in the second statement is unique. Note also that the equivalence **1**  $\Leftrightarrow$  **3** is a generalization of Hindmarsh's theorem to the class of functions whose Pick matrices have a bounded number of negative eigenvalues, and coincides with Theorem 1.1 if  $\kappa = 0$ .

The third statement in Theorem 1.7 raises the question of the minimal possible value of  $n$  for which (1.4) holds. For convenience of future reference we denote this minimal value by  $N(f)$ :

$$N(f) = \min_n \{n : \mathbf{k}_n(f) = \kappa\}, \quad f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa. \quad (1.7)$$

**Theorem 1.8** *Let  $f$  be a standard function with  $q$  poles and  $\ell$  jumps. Then  $f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$ , where  $\kappa = q + \ell$ , and*

$$q + \ell \leq N(f) \leq q + 2\ell. \quad (1.8)$$

The left inequality in (1.8) is self-evident (to have  $\kappa$  negative eigenvalues, a Hermitian matrix must be of size at least  $\kappa \times \kappa$ ), while the right inequality is the essence of the theorem. We shall show that inequalities (1.8) are exact; here we present a simple example showing that these inequalities can be strict.

**Example 1.9** Let

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} 1, & z \neq 0, \\ a \neq 1, & z = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then  $f(z)$  is a standard function from  $\mathcal{S}_1$  with no poles and one jump and Theorem 1.8 guarantees that  $1 \leq N(f) \leq 2$ . More detailed analysis shows that if  $|a| > 1$ , then  $\mathbf{k}_n(f) = 1$  for  $n \geq 1$  and therefore  $1 = N(f) < 2$ . If  $|a| \leq 1$ , then  $\mathbf{k}_1(f) = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{k}_n(f) = 1$  for  $n \geq 2$  and therefore  $1 < N(f) = 2$ .

The following addition to Theorem 1.8 is useful:

**Remark 1.10** *Let  $f$  be as in Theorem 1.8. Let  $w_1, \dots, w_k$  be the distinct poles of  $f$  with multiplicities  $r_1, \dots, r_k$ , respectively, and let  $z_1, \dots, z_\ell$  be the (distinct) jumps of  $f$ . Then there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that every set  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$  of  $m := q + 2\ell$  distinct points satisfying the conditions 1 - 3 listed below has the property that*

$$\text{sq}_-P_m(f; y_1, \dots, y_m) = q + \ell.$$

1.  $\ell$  points in the set  $Y$  coincide with  $z_1, \dots, z_\ell$ ;
2.  $\ell$  points in  $Y$ , different from  $z_1, \dots, z_\ell$ , are at a distance less than  $\epsilon$  from the set  $\{z_1, \dots, z_\ell\}$ ;
3. the remaining  $q$  points in  $Y$  are distributed over  $k$  disjoint subsets  $Y_1, \dots, Y_k$  such that the set  $Y_j$  consists of  $r_j$  points all at a positive distance less than  $\epsilon$  from  $w_j$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .

The proof of Remark 1.10 is obtained in the course of the proof of Theorem 1.8.

Still another characterization of the class  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$  is given in the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.11** *Let  $f$  be as in Theorem 1.7, and fix a nonnegative integer  $\kappa$ . Then:*

1. *If  $\mathbf{k}_{2\kappa}(f) = \mathbf{k}_{2\kappa+3}(f) = \kappa$ , then  $f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$ .*
2. *If  $f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$ , then  $\mathbf{k}_{2\kappa} = \kappa$ .*

Example 1.9 (with  $|a| \leq 1$ ) shows that for a fixed  $\kappa$ , the subscript  $2\kappa$  in Theorem 1.11 cannot be replaced by any smaller nonnegative integer.

Theorems 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11 comprise the main results of this paper.

Sections 2 through 4 contain the proofs of Theorems 1.7 and 1.8. In Section 5, a local result is proved to the effect that for a function  $f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$  and any open set  $\Omega$  in  $\text{Dom}(f)$ , the requisite number of negative eigenvalues of Pick matrices  $P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n)$  can be achieved when the points  $z_j$  are restricted to belong to  $\Omega$ . Hindmarsh sets and their elementary properties are introduced in Section 6, where we also state an open problem.

If not stated explicitly otherwise, all functions are assumed to be scalar (complex valued). The superscript  $*$  stands for the conjugate of a complex number or the conjugate transpose of a matrix.

## 2 Theorem 1.7: part of the proof

In this section we prove implication **3**  $\Rightarrow$  **1** of Theorem 1.7. We start with some auxiliary lemmas.

**Lemma 2.1** *If an  $m \times m$  matrix  $X$  has rank  $k < m$  and the algebraic multiplicity of zero as an eigenvalue of  $X$  is  $m - k$ , then there exists a  $k \times k$  nonsingular principal submatrix of  $X$ .*

**Proof:** The characteristic polynomial of  $X$  has the form  $\lambda^m + a_{m-1}\lambda^{m-1} + \dots + a_{m-k}\lambda^{m-k}$ , where  $a_{m-k} \neq 0$ . Since  $\pm a_{m-k}$  is the sum of all determinants of  $k \times k$  principal submatrices of  $X$ , at least one of those determinants must be nonzero.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.2** *Let  $X$  be a Hermitian  $n \times n$  matrix. Then*

1.  $\text{sq}_-Y \geq \text{sq}_-X$  for all Hermitian matrices  $Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  in some small neighborhood of  $X$ .
2.  $\text{sq}_-P^*XP \leq \text{sq}_-X$  for every  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ . In particular, if  $X_0$  is any principal submatrix of  $X$ , then  $\text{sq}_-X_0 \leq \text{sq}_-X$ .
3. If  $\{X_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of Hermitian matrices such that  $\text{sq}_-X_m \leq k$  for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , and  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m = X$ , then also  $\text{sq}_-X \leq k$ .

**Proof:** The first and third statements easily follow by the continuity properties of eigenvalues of Hermitian matrices. The second statement is a consequence from the interlacing properties of eigenvalues of Hermitian matrices, see, e.g. [15, Section 8.4].  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3** *Let  $f$  be a function defined on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a discrete set.*

1. If  $g$  is defined on a set  $(\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda) \cup \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$  (the points  $w_1, \dots, w_k \in \mathbb{D}$  are not assumed to be distinct or to be disjoint with  $\Lambda$ ) and  $g(z) = f(z)$  for every  $z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , then

$$\mathbf{k}_n(f) \leq \mathbf{k}_n(g) \leq \max_{0 \leq r \leq \min\{k, n\}} \{\mathbf{k}_{n-r}(f) + r\} \leq \mathbf{k}_n(f) + k, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \quad (2.1)$$

2. If  $g$  is defined on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , and  $g(z) = f(z)$  for every  $z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , except for  $k$  distinct points  $z_1, \dots, z_k \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , then

$$\mathbf{k}_n(g) \leq \mathbf{k}_n(f) + k, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

**Proof:** We prove the first statement. The first inequality in (2.1) follows from the definition (1.3) of  $\mathbf{k}_n(f)$ . Let  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  be a set of distinct points in  $(\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda) \cup \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$ , and assume that exactly  $r$  points among  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  are in the set  $\{w_1, \dots, w_k\} \setminus (\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda)$ . For notational convenience, suppose that  $y_1, \dots, y_r \in \{w_1, \dots, w_k\} \setminus (\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda)$ . We have

$$P_n(g; y_1, \dots, y_n) = \begin{bmatrix} * & * \\ * & P_{n-r}(f; y_{r+1}, \dots, y_n) \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $*$  denotes blocks of no immediate interest. By the interlacing properties of eigenvalues of Hermitian matrices, we have

$$\text{sq}_- P_n(g; y_1, \dots, y_n) \leq \text{sq}_- P_{n-r}(f; y_{r+1}, \dots, y_n) + r \leq \mathbf{k}_{n-r}(f) + r,$$

and, since  $0 \leq r \leq \min\{n, k\}$ , the second and third inequalities in (2.1) follow.

For the second statement, using induction on  $k$ , we need to prove only the case  $k = 1$ . Let  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  be a set of distinct points in  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ . Then

$$P_n(g; y_1, \dots, y_n) = P_n(f; y_1, \dots, y_n) + Q, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $Q$  is either the zero matrix (if  $y_j \neq z_1$ ), or  $Q$  has an  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  principal zero submatrix (if  $y_j = z_1$  for some  $j$ ), and in any case  $Q$  has at most one negative eigenvalue. Let  $k = \text{sq}_- P_n(g; y_1, \dots, y_n)$ . Then (2.2) implies, using the Weyl inequalities for eigenvalues of the sum of two Hermitian matrices (see, e.g., [8, Section III.2]) that  $\text{sq}_- P_n(f; y_1, \dots, y_n) \leq k + 1$ .  $\square$

**Proof of  $3 \Rightarrow 1$  of Theorem 1.7.** Let  $f$  be defined on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda$  is discrete. Furthermore, let (1.6) hold for some integer  $n \geq 0$  and let the set

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\} \subset \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$$

be such that

$$\text{sq}_- P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n) = \kappa.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that

$$P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n) = \left[ \frac{1 - f(z_i)f(z_j)^*}{1 - z_i z_j^*} \right]_{i,j=1}^n \quad (2.3)$$

is not singular. Indeed, if it happens that the matrix (2.3) is singular, and its rank is  $m < n$ , then by Lemma 2.1, there is a nonsingular  $m \times m$  principal submatrix  $P_m(f; z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_m})$  of (2.3). A Schur complement argument shows that

$$\text{sq}_- P_m(f; z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_m}) = \kappa.$$

It follows then that  $\mathbf{k}_m(f) = \kappa$ . But then, in view of (1.6) and the nondecreasing property of the sequence  $\{\mathbf{k}_j(f)\}_{j=1}^\infty$ , we have  $\mathbf{k}_{m+3}(f) = \kappa$ , and the subsequent proof may be repeated with  $n$  replaced by  $m$ .



Setting  $P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n) = P$  for short, note the identity

$$P - TPT^* = FJF^*, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} z_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & z_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad J = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & f(z_1) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & f(z_n) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.5)$$

Consider the function

$$\Theta(z) = I_2 - (1 - z)F^*(I_n - zT^*)^{-1}P^{-1}(I_n - T)^{-1}FJ \quad (2.6)$$

It follows from (2.4) by a straightforward standard calculation (see, e.g., [6, Section 7.1]) that

$$J - \Theta(z)J\Theta(w)^* = (1 - zw^*)F^*(I_n - zT^*)^{-1}P^{-1}(I_n - w^*T)^{-1}F. \quad (2.7)$$

Note that  $\Theta(z)$  is a rational function taking  $J$ -unitary values on  $\mathbb{T}$ :  $\Theta(z)J\Theta(z)^* = J$  for  $z \in \mathbb{T}$ . Therefore, by the symmetry principle,

$$\Theta(z)^{-1} = J\Theta\left(\frac{1}{z^*}\right)^*J = I_2 + (1 - z)F^*(I_n - T^*)^{-1}P^{-1}(zI_n - T)^{-1}FJ,$$

which implies, in particular, that  $\Theta(z)$  is invertible at each point  $z \notin \mathcal{Z}$ . By (1.6) and by Lemma 2.2,

$$\text{sq}_-P_{n+3}(f; z_1, \dots, z_n, \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3) = \kappa \quad (2.8)$$

for every choice of  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3 \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ . The matrix in (2.8) can be written in the block form as

$$P_{n+3}(f; z_1, \dots, z_n, \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3) = \begin{bmatrix} P & \Psi^* \\ \Psi & P_3(f; \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_i = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1 - f(\zeta_i)f(z_1)^*}{1 - \zeta_i z_1^*} & \dots & \frac{1 - f(\zeta_i)f(z_n)^*}{1 - \zeta_i z_n^*} \end{bmatrix} \quad (i = 1, 2, 3).$$

The last formula for  $\Psi_i$  can be written in terms of (2.5) as

$$\Psi_i = [1 \quad -f(\zeta_i)]F^*(I_n - \zeta_i T^*)^{-1} \quad (i = 1, 2, 3). \quad (2.10)$$

By (1.6), it follows from (2.9) that

$$P_3(f; \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3) - \Psi P^{-1} \Psi^* \geq 0,$$

or more explicitly,

$$\left[ \frac{1 - f(\zeta_i) f(\zeta_j)^*}{1 - \zeta_i \zeta_j^*} - \Psi_i P^{-1} \Psi_j^* \right]_{i,j=1}^3 \geq 0. \quad (2.11)$$

By (2.10) and (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 - f(\zeta_i) f(\zeta_j)^*}{1 - \zeta_i \zeta_j^*} - \Psi_i P^{-1} \Psi_j^* \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -f(\zeta_i) \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \frac{J}{1 - \zeta_i \zeta_j^*} - F^* (I_n - \zeta_i T^*)^{-1} P^{-1} (I_n - \zeta_j^* T)^{-1} F \right\} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -f(\zeta_j)^* \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -f(\zeta_i) \end{bmatrix} \frac{\Theta(\zeta_i) J \Theta(\zeta_j)^*}{1 - \zeta_i \zeta_j^*} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -f(\zeta_j)^* \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

which allows us to rewrite (2.11) as

$$\left[ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -f(\zeta_i) \end{bmatrix} \frac{\Theta(\zeta_i) J \Theta(\zeta_j)^*}{1 - \zeta_i \zeta_j^*} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -f(\zeta_j)^* \end{bmatrix} \right]_{i,j=1}^3 \geq 0. \quad (2.13)$$

Introducing the block decomposition

$$\Theta(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_{11}(z) & \theta_{12}(z) \\ \theta_{21}(z) & \theta_{22}(z) \end{bmatrix}$$

of  $\Theta$  into four scalar blocks, note that

$$d(z) := \theta_{21}(z) f(z) - \theta_{11}(z) \neq 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \Lambda). \quad (2.14)$$

Indeed, assuming that  $\theta_{21}(\zeta) f(\zeta) = \theta_{11}(\zeta)$  for some  $\zeta \in \mathbb{D} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \Lambda)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -f(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} \frac{\Theta(\zeta) J \Theta(\zeta)^*}{1 - |\zeta|^2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -f(\zeta)^* \end{bmatrix} \\ &= - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -f(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} \frac{\begin{bmatrix} \theta_{12}(\zeta) \\ \theta_{22}(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \theta_{12}(\zeta)^* & \theta_{22}(\zeta)^* \end{bmatrix}}{1 - |\zeta|^2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -f(\zeta)^* \end{bmatrix} \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (2.13), unless  $\det \Theta(\zeta) = 0$ . But as we have mentioned above,  $\Theta(z)$  is invertible at each point  $\zeta \notin \mathcal{Z}$ .

Thus, the function

$$\sigma(z) = \frac{\theta_{12}(z) - f(z) \theta_{22}(z)}{\theta_{21}(z) f(z) - \theta_{11}(z)} \quad (2.15)$$

is defined on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \Lambda)$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -f(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} \Theta(\zeta) = -d(\zeta)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\sigma(\zeta) \end{bmatrix}$$

and thus, inequality (2.13) can be written in terms of  $\sigma$  as

$$\left[ d(\zeta_i)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\sigma(\zeta_i) \end{bmatrix} \frac{J}{1 - \zeta_i \zeta_j^*} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -\sigma(\zeta_j)^* \end{bmatrix} (d(\zeta_j)^*)^{-1} \right]_{i,j=1}^3 \geq 0,$$

or equivalently, (since  $d(\zeta_i) \neq 0$ ) as

$$\left[ \frac{1 - \sigma(\zeta_i) \sigma(\zeta_j)^*}{1 - \zeta_i \zeta_j^*} \right]_{i,j=1}^3 \geq 0.$$

The latter inequality means that  $P_3(\sigma; \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3) \geq 0$  for every choice of points  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3$  in  $\mathbb{D} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \Lambda)$ . By Corollary 1.2,  $\sigma(z)$  is a Schur function. Although  $\sigma(z)$  has been defined via (2.15) on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_n\})$ , it admits an analytic continuation to all of  $\mathbb{D}$ , which still will be denoted by  $\sigma(z)$ . It follows from (2.15) that  $f$  coincides with the function

$$F(z) = \frac{\theta_{11}(z)\sigma(z) + \theta_{12}(z)}{\theta_{21}(z)\sigma(z) + \theta_{22}(z)}. \quad (2.16)$$

at every point  $z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \Lambda)$ . Since  $f$  has not been defined on  $\Lambda$ , one can consider  $F$  as a (unique) meromorphic extension of  $f$ . However,  $F$  need not coincide with  $f$  on  $\mathcal{Z}$ .

Now we prove that  $f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$ . To this end it suffices to show that

$$\text{sq}_- P_{n+r}(f; z_1, \dots, z_n, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r) = \kappa \quad (2.17)$$

for every choice of  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r \in \mathbb{D} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \Lambda)$ . Note that all possible “jumps” of  $f$  are in  $\mathcal{Z}$  and at all other points of  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , it holds that  $f(\zeta) = F(\zeta)$ . Thus, writing

$$P_{n+r}(f; z_1, \dots, z_n, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r) = \begin{bmatrix} P & \Psi^* \\ \Psi & P_r(f; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r) \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Psi_r \end{bmatrix}$$

and the  $\Psi_i$ 's are defined via (2.10) for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , we conclude by the Schur complement argument that

$$\text{sq}_- P_{n+r}(f; z_1, \dots, z_n, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r) = \text{sq}_- P + \text{sq}_- (P_r(f; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r) - \Psi P^{-1} \Psi^*). \quad (2.18)$$

It follows from the calculation (2.12) that

$$P_r(f; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r) - \Psi P^{-1} \Psi^* = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 1 & -f(\zeta_i) \end{array} \right] \frac{\Theta(\zeta_i) J \Theta(\zeta_j)^*}{1 - \zeta_i \zeta_j^*} \left[ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ -f(\zeta_j)^* \end{array} \right]_{i,j=1}^r,$$

which can be written in terms of functions  $\sigma$  and  $d$  defined in (2.15) and (2.14), respectively, as

$$P_r(f; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r) - \Psi P^{-1} \Psi^* = \left[ d(\zeta_i)^{-1} \frac{1 - \sigma(\zeta_i) \sigma(\zeta_j)^*}{1 - \zeta_i \zeta_j^*} (d(\zeta_j)^*)^{-1} \right]_{i,j=1}^r.$$

We have already proved that  $\sigma$  is a Schur function and therefore,

$$P_r(f; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r) - \Psi P^{-1} \Psi^* \geq 0,$$

which together with (2.18) implies (2.17).  $\square$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.8

Since the first inequality in (1.8) is obvious, we need to prove only the second inequality.

If  $\tilde{f}$  is the meromorphic part of  $f$ , then by Theorem 1.4  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{S}_q$ , and therefore by Lemma 2.3,  $\mathbf{k}_n(f) \leq q + \ell$ , for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Therefore, it suffices to prove that there exist  $q + 2\ell$  distinct points  $u_1, \dots, u_{q+2\ell} \in \text{Dom}(f)$  such that

$$\text{sq}_- P_{q+2\ell}(f; u_1, \dots, u_{q+2\ell}) \geq q + \ell.$$

We start with notation and some preliminary results. Let

$$J_r(a) = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & a & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & a & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & a \end{bmatrix}, \quad a \in \mathbb{C}$$

be the lower triangular  $r \times r$  Jordan block with eigenvalue  $a$  and let  $E_r$  and  $G_r$  be vectors from  $\mathbb{C}^r$  defined by

$$E_r = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^r \quad \text{and} \quad G_r = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^r. \quad (3.1)$$

Given an ordered set  $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$  of distinct points in the complex plane, we denote by  $\Phi(\mathcal{Z})$  the lower triangular  $k \times k$  matrix defined by

$$\Phi(\mathcal{Z}) = [\Phi_{i,j}]_{i,j=1}^k, \quad \Phi_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\phi'_i(z_j)} & \text{if } i \geq j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i < j, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\phi_i(z) = \prod_{j=1}^i (z - z_j)$ . Furthermore, given a set  $\mathcal{Z}$  as above, for a complex valued function  $v(z)$  we define recursively the divided differences  $[z_1, \dots, z_j]_v$  by

$$[z_1]_v = v(z_1), \quad [z_1, \dots, z_{j+1}]_v = \frac{[z_1, \dots, z_j]_v - [z_2, \dots, z_{j+1}]_v}{z_1 - z_{j+1}}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k,$$

and use the following notation for associated matrices and vectors:

$$D(\mathcal{Z}) = \begin{bmatrix} z_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & z_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad J(\mathcal{Z}) = \begin{bmatrix} z_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & z_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & z_3 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & z_k \end{bmatrix},$$

$$v(\mathcal{Z}) = \begin{bmatrix} v(z_1) \\ v(z_2) \\ \vdots \\ v(z_k) \end{bmatrix}, \quad [\mathcal{Z}]_v = \begin{bmatrix} [z_1]_v \\ [z_1, z_2]_v \\ \vdots \\ [z_1, \dots, z_k]_v \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.3)$$

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$  be an ordered set of distinct points, and let  $\Phi(\mathcal{Z})$  be defined as in (3.2). Then:*

$$\Phi(\mathcal{Z})D(\mathcal{Z}) = J(\mathcal{Z})\Phi(\mathcal{Z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(\mathcal{Z})v(\mathcal{Z}) = [\mathcal{Z}]_v. \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, if the function  $v(z)$  is analytic at  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ , with the Taylor series  $v(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} v_k(z - z_0)^k$ , then

$$\lim_{z_1, \dots, z_k \rightarrow z_0} \Phi(\mathcal{Z})v(\mathcal{Z}) = \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_1 \\ \vdots \\ v_{k-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.5)$$

**Proof:** Formulas (3.4) are verified by direct computation; formula (3.5) follows from (3.4), since

$$\lim_{z_i \rightarrow z_0, i=1, \dots, j} [z_1, \dots, z_j]_v = \frac{v^{(j-1)}(z_0)}{(j-1)!} = v_{j-1}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

In the sequel it will be convenient to use the following notation:  $\text{diag}(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  stands for the block diagonal matrix with the diagonal blocks  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  (in that order).

**Lemma 3.2** *Let  $w_1, \dots, w_k$  be distinct points in  $\mathbb{D}$ , and let  $K$  be the unique solution of the Stein equation*

$$K - AK A^* = EE^*, \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} J_{r_1}(w_1) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & J_{r_k}(w_k) \end{bmatrix}, \quad E = \begin{bmatrix} E_{r_1} \\ \vdots \\ E_{r_k} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.7)$$

and  $E_{r_j}$  are defined via the first formula in (3.1). Then the normalized Blaschke product

$$b(z) = e^{i\alpha} \prod_{j=1}^k \left( \frac{z - w_j}{1 - \bar{z} \bar{w}_j^*} \right)^{r_j}, \quad b(1) = 1, \quad (3.8)$$

admits a realization

$$b(z) = 1 + (z - 1)E^*(I - zA^*)^{-1}K^{-1}(I - A)^{-1}E, \quad (3.9)$$

and the following formula holds:

$$1 - b(z)b(w)^* = (1 - zw^*)E^*(I - zA^*)^{-1}K^{-1}(I - w^*A)^{-1}E, \quad z, w \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (3.10)$$

**Proof:** First we note that  $K$  is given by the convergent series

$$K = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} A^j E E^* (A^*)^j. \quad (3.11)$$

Since the pair  $(E^*, A^*)$  is observable, i.e.,  $\cap_{j=0}^{\infty} \text{Ker}(E^*(A^*)^j) = \{0\}$ , the matrix  $K$  is positive definite. Equality (3.10) follows from (3.9) and (3.6) by a standard straightforward calculation (or from (2.7) upon setting  $J = I_2$  in (2.5)–(2.7)). It follows from (3.10) that the function  $b(z)$  defined via (3.9) is inner. Using the fact that  $\det(I + XY) = \det(I + YX)$  for matrices  $X$  and  $Y$  of sizes  $u \times v$  and  $v \times u$  respectively, we obtain from (3.6) and (3.9):

$$\begin{aligned} b(z) &= \det(I + (z - 1)(I - zA^*)^{-1}K^{-1}(I - A)^{-1}(K - AK A^*)) \\ &= \det((I - zA^*)^{-1}K^{-1}(I - A)^{-1}) \\ &\quad \times \det((I - A)K(I - zA^*) + (z - 1)(K - AK A^*)) \\ &= \det((I - zA^*)^{-1}K^{-1}(I - A)^{-1}) \cdot \det((zI - A)K(I - A^*)) \\ &= c \frac{\det(zI - A)}{\det(I - zA^*)} \quad \text{for some } c \in \mathbb{C}, |c| = 1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the degree of  $b(z)$  is equal to  $r := \sum_{j=1}^k r_j$ , and  $b(z)$  has zeros at  $w_1, \dots, w_k$  of multiplicities  $r_1, \dots, r_k$ , respectively. Since  $b(1) = 1$ , the function  $b(z)$  indeed coincides with (3.8).  $\square$

The result of Lemma 3.2 is known also for matrix valued inner functions (see [6, Section 7.4], where it is given in a slightly different form for  $J$ -unitary matrix functions), in which case it can be interpreted as a formula for such functions having a prescribed left null pair with respect to the unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$  (see [6] and relevant references there).

Let

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{S(z)}{b(z)} & \text{if } z \notin \{z_1, \dots, z_\ell, w_{t+1}, \dots, w_k\} \\ f_j & \text{if } z = z_j, j = 1, \dots, \ell \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

where  $S(z)$  is a Schur function not vanishing at any of the  $z_j$ 's,  $b(z)$  is the Blaschke product given by (3.8). The points  $z_1, \dots, z_\ell$  are assumed to be distinct points in  $\mathbb{D}$ , and  $w_1, \dots, w_k$  are also assumed to be distinct in  $\mathbb{D}$ . Furthermore, we assume that  $w_j = z_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, t$ ,  $\{w_{t+1}, \dots, w_k\} \cap \{z_{t+1}, \dots, z_\ell\} = \emptyset$ , and  $\frac{S(z_j)}{b(z_j)} \neq f_j$  for  $j = t+1, \dots, \ell$ . The cases when  $t = 0$ , i.e.,  $\{w_1, \dots, w_k\} \cap \{z_1, \dots, z_\ell\} = \emptyset$ , and when  $t = \min\{k, \ell\}$  are not excluded; in these cases the subsequent arguments should be modified in obvious ways. We let  $N = 2\ell + \sum_{j=1}^k r_j$ .

Take  $N$  distinct points in the unit disk sorted into  $k+2$  ordered sets

$$\mathcal{M}_j = \{\mu_{j,1}, \dots, \mu_{j,r_j}\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k; \quad \mathcal{N} = \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_\ell\}; \quad \mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_\ell\} \quad (3.13)$$

and such that  $\mathcal{M}_j \cap \mathcal{W} = \emptyset$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , and  $\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{W} = \emptyset$ , where  $\mathcal{W} = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$ . Consider the corresponding Pick matrix

$$P = P_N(f; \mu_{1,1}, \dots, \mu_{k,r_k}, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_\ell, z_1, \dots, z_\ell).$$

We shall show that if  $\mu_{j,i}$  and  $\nu_j$  are sufficiently close to  $w_j$  and  $z_j$ , respectively, then  $\text{sq}_- P \geq N - \ell$ .

It is readily seen that  $P$  is a unique solution of the Stein equation

$$P - TPT^* = G_N G_N^* - CC^* \quad (3.14)$$

where  $G_N \in \mathbb{C}^N$  is defined via the second formula in (3.1) and

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} D(\mathcal{M}_1) & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & D(\mathcal{M}_k) & \\ & & & D(\mathcal{N}) \\ & & & & D(\mathcal{Z}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} f(\mathcal{M}_1) \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathcal{M}_k) \\ f(\mathcal{N}) \\ f(\mathcal{Z}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

We recall that by definition (3.3) and in view of (3.12),

$$f(\mathcal{M}_j) = \begin{bmatrix} f(\mu_{j,1}) \\ \vdots \\ f(\mu_{j,r_j}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad f(\mathcal{N}) = \begin{bmatrix} f(\nu_1) \\ \vdots \\ f(\nu_\ell) \end{bmatrix}, \quad f(\mathcal{Z}) = \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ f_\ell \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consider the matrices

$$B_j = \Phi(\mathcal{M}_j) \text{diag} (b(\mu_{j,1}), \dots, b(\mu_{j,r_j})) \quad (j = 1, \dots, k)$$

and note that by Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} B_j D(\mathcal{M}_j) &= \Phi(\mathcal{M}_j) D(\mathcal{M}_j) \text{diag} (b(\mu_{j,1}), \dots, b(\mu_{j,r_j})) \\ &= J(\mathcal{M}_j) \Phi(\mathcal{M}_j) \text{diag} (b(\mu_{j,1}), \dots, b(\mu_{j,r_j})) \\ &= J(\mathcal{M}_j) B_j, \\ B_j f(\mathcal{M}_j) &= \Phi(\mathcal{M}_j) S(\mathcal{M}_j) = [\mathcal{M}_j]_S, \\ B_j G_{r_j} &= \Phi(\mathcal{M}_j) b(\mathcal{M}_j) = [\mathcal{M}_j]_b. \end{aligned}$$

The three last equalities together with block structure of the matrices  $T$ ,  $C$  and  $G_N$ , lead to

$$BT = T_1 B, \quad Y_1 = BY, \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 = BC, \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$B = \text{diag} (B_1, \dots, B_j, I_{2\ell}), \quad T_1 = \text{diag} (J(\mathcal{M}_1), \dots, J(\mathcal{M}_k), D(\mathcal{N}), D(\mathcal{Z})), \quad (3.16)$$

$$Y_1 = \begin{bmatrix} [\mathcal{M}_1]_b \\ \vdots \\ [\mathcal{M}_k]_b \\ G_{2\ell} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} [\mathcal{M}_1]_S \\ \vdots \\ [\mathcal{M}_k]_S \\ f(\mathcal{N}) \\ f(\mathcal{Z}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.17)$$

Pre- and post-multiplying (3.14) by  $B$  and  $B^*$ , respectively, we conclude, on account of (3.15), that the matrix  $P_1 := B P B^*$  is the unique solution of the Stein equation

$$P_1 - T_1 P_1 T_1^* = Y_1 Y_1^* - C_1 C_1^*, \quad (3.18)$$

where  $T_1$ ,  $Y_1$ , and  $C_1$  are given by (3.16) and (3.17).

Recall that all the entries in (3.18) depend on the  $\mu_{j,i}$ 's. We now let  $\mu_{j,i} \rightarrow w_j$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Since  $b$  has zero of order  $r_j$  at  $w_j$ , it follows by (3.5) that

$$\lim_{\mu_{j,i} \rightarrow w_j} [\mathcal{M}_j]_b = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, k,$$



and thus,

$$Y_2 := \lim_{\mu_{j,i} \rightarrow w_j} Y_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G_{2\ell} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^N.$$

Similarly, we get by (3.3),

$$C_2 := \lim_{\mu_{j,i} \rightarrow w_j} C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{S}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{S}_k \\ f(\mathcal{N}) \\ f(\mathcal{Z}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \widehat{S}_j = \begin{bmatrix} S(w_j) \\ \frac{S'(w_j)}{1!} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{S^{(r_j-1)}(w_j)}{(r_j-1)!} \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} s_{j,0} \\ s_{j,1} \\ \vdots \\ s_{j,r_j-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, taking the limit in (3.16) as  $\mu_{j,i} \rightarrow w_j$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 := \lim_{\mu_{j,i} \rightarrow w_j} T_1 &= \text{diag} (J_{r_1}(w_1), \dots, J_{r_k}(w_k), D(\mathcal{N}), D(\mathcal{Z})) \\ &= \text{diag} (A, D(\mathcal{N}), D(\mathcal{Z})), \end{aligned}$$

where  $A$  is given in (3.7). Since the above three limits exist, there also exists the limit

$$P_2 := \lim_{\mu_{j,i} \rightarrow w_j} P_1, \tag{3.19}$$

which serves to define a unique solution  $P_2$  of the Stein equation

$$P_2 - T_2 P_2 T_2^* = Y_2 Y_2^* - C_2 C_2^*. \tag{3.20}$$

Let  $\mathcal{S}_j$  be the lower triangular Toeplitz matrices defined by:

$$\mathcal{S}_j = \begin{bmatrix} s_{j,0} & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ s_{j,1} & s_{j,0} & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ s_{j,r_j-2} & & \dots & s_{j,0} & 0 \\ s_{j,r_j-1} & s_{j,r_j-2} & \dots & s_{j,1} & s_{j,0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k,$$

which are invertible because  $S(w_j) = s_{j,0} \neq 0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Let

$$R := \text{diag} (\mathcal{S}_1^{-1}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_k^{-1}, I_{2\ell}) \quad \text{and} \quad C_3 = \begin{bmatrix} E \\ f(\mathcal{N}) \\ f(\mathcal{Z}) \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $E$  is given in (3.7). The block structure of matrices  $R$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $C_2$ ,  $C_3$ ,  $E$  and  $Y_2$  together with selfevident relations

$$\mathcal{S}_j^{-1} J_{r_j}(w_j) = J_{r_j}(w_j) \mathcal{S}_j^{-1}, \quad \mathcal{S}_j^{-1} \widehat{S}_1 = E_{r_j} \quad (j = 1, \dots, k),$$

lead to

$$RT_2 = T_2R, \quad RC_2 = C_3 \quad \text{and} \quad RY_2 = Y_2.$$

Taking into account the three last equalities, we pre- and post-multiply (3.20) by  $R$  and  $R^*$ , respectively, to conclude that the matrix  $P_3 := RP_2R^*$  is the unique solution of the Stein equation

$$P_3 - T_2P_3T_2^* = Y_2Y_2^* - C_3C_3^*. \quad (3.21)$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_1 &= \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_t\}, & \mathcal{Z}_1 &= \{z_1, \dots, z_t\}, \\ \mathcal{N}_2 &= \{\nu_{t+1}, \dots, \nu_\ell\}, & \mathcal{Z}_2 &= \{z_{t+1}, \dots, z_\ell\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the hypothesis,  $\mathcal{Z}_2 \cap \mathcal{W} = \emptyset$ . Let  $\nu_j \rightarrow z_j$  for  $j = t+1, \dots, \ell$ . Then

$$f(\mathcal{N}_2) \rightarrow \frac{S}{b}(\mathcal{Z}_2),$$

and note that by the assumptions on  $f$ ,

$$\frac{S}{b}(z_j) \neq f(z_j), \quad j = t+1, \dots, \ell. \quad (3.22)$$

Taking limits in (3.21) as  $\nu_j \rightarrow z_j$  ( $j = t+1, \dots, \ell$ ), we arrive at the equality

$$P_4 - T_3P_4T_3^* = Y_2Y_2^* - C_4C_4^*, \quad P_4 := \lim_{\nu_j \rightarrow z_j, j=t+1, \dots, \ell} P_3, \quad (3.23)$$

where

$$T_3 = \text{diag} (A, D(\mathcal{N}_1), D(\mathcal{Z}_2), D(\mathcal{Z}_1), D(\mathcal{Z}_2)), \quad C_4 = \begin{bmatrix} E \\ f(\mathcal{N}_1) \\ \frac{S}{b}(\mathcal{Z}_2) \\ f(\mathcal{Z}_1) \\ f(\mathcal{Z}_2) \end{bmatrix}.$$

By (3.22), the matrix

$$L := \text{diag} \left( \left( \frac{S}{b} - f \right) (z_{t+1}), \dots, \left( \frac{S}{b} - f \right) (z_\ell) \right)$$

is invertible. Let

$$T_4 = \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & D(\mathcal{Z}_2) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & D(\mathcal{Z}_1) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D(\mathcal{N}_1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_5 = \begin{bmatrix} E \\ G_{\ell-t} \\ f(\mathcal{Z}_1) \\ f(\mathcal{N}_1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G_{2t} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.24)$$

and

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} I_{N-2\ell} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & L^{-1} & 0 & -L^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_t & 0 \\ 0 & I_t & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since

$$XT_3 = T_4X, \quad XC_4 = C_5, \quad XY_2 = Y_3,$$

pre- and post-multiplication of (3.23) by  $X$  and by  $X^*$ , respectively, leads to the conclusion that the matrix  $P_5 := XP_4X^*$  is the unique solution of the Stein equation

$$P_5 - T_4P_5T_4^* = Y_3Y_3^* - C_5C_5^*. \quad (3.25)$$

By (3.24) and (3.25),  $P_5$  has the form

$$P_5 = \left[ \begin{array}{c|ccc} -K & Q_1^* & Q_2^* & Q_3^* \\ \hline Q_1 & R_{11} & R_{12} & R_{13} \\ Q_2 & R_{21} & R_{22} & R_{23} \\ Q_3 & R_{31} & R_{32} & R_{33} \end{array} \right],$$

where  $K$  is the matrix given by (3.11), and  $Q_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , are solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 - D(\mathcal{Z}_2)Q_1A^* &= -G_{\ell-t}E^*, \\ Q_2 - D(\mathcal{Z}_1)Q_2A^* &= -f(\mathcal{Z}_1)E^*, \\ Q_3 - D(\mathcal{N}_1)Q_3A^* &= -f(\mathcal{N}_1)E^*, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Thus, denoting by  $[Q_\alpha]_j$  the  $j$ th row of  $Q_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ , we have from the three last equalities (recall that  $w_j = z_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, t$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} [Q_1]_j &= -E^*(I - z_{j+t}A^*)^{-1}, & j = 1, \dots, \ell - t; \\ [Q_2]_j &= -f_jE^*(I - w_jA^*)^{-1}, & j = 1, \dots, t; \\ [Q_3]_j &= -f(\nu_j)E^*(I - \nu_jA^*)^{-1}, & j = 1, \dots, t. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, in view of the three last relations and (3.10), and since  $b(w_j) = 0$ , follow-

ing equalities are obtained:

$$\begin{aligned}
[Q_1]_j K^{-1} [Q_1]_i^* &= \frac{1 - b(z_{t+j})b(z_{t+i})^*}{1 - z_{t+j}z_{t+i}^*}, \quad j, i = 1, \dots, \ell - t, \\
[Q_2]_j K^{-1} [Q_1]_i^* &= \frac{f_j}{1 - w_j z_{t+i}^*}, \quad j = 1, \dots, t; \quad i = 1, \dots, \ell - t, \\
[Q_3]_j K^{-1} [Q_1]_i^* &= f(\nu_j) \frac{1 - b(\nu_j)b(z_{t+i})^*}{1 - \nu_j z_{t+i}^*}, \quad j = 1, \dots, t; \quad i = 1, \dots, \ell - t, \\
[Q_2]_j K^{-1} [Q_2]_i^* &= \frac{f_j f_i^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*}, \quad j, i = 1, \dots, t, \\
[Q_3]_j K^{-1} [Q_2]_i^* &= \frac{f(\nu_j) f_i^*}{1 - \nu_j w_i^*}, \quad j, i = 1, \dots, t, \\
[Q_3]_j K^{-1} [Q_3]_i^* &= f(\nu_j) f(\nu_i)^* \frac{1 - b(\nu_j)b(\nu_i)^*}{1 - \nu_j \nu_i^*}, \quad j, i = 1, \dots, t.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, the Schur complements are computed:

$$\begin{aligned}
[R_{11} + Q_1 K^{-1} Q_1^*]_{ji} &= \frac{-1}{1 - z_{t+j}z_{t+i}^*} + \frac{1 - b(z_{t+j})b(z_{t+i})^*}{1 - z_{t+j}z_{t+i}^*} \\
&= -\frac{b(z_{t+j})b(z_{t+i})^*}{1 - z_{t+j}z_{t+i}^*}, \\
[R_{21} + Q_2 K^{-1} Q_1^*]_{ji} &= 0, \\
[R_{31} + Q_3 K^{-1} Q_1^*]_{ji} &= -\frac{f(\nu_j)}{1 - \nu_j z_{t+i}^*} + f(\nu_j) \frac{1 - b(\nu_j)b(z_{t+i})^*}{1 - \nu_j z_{t+i}^*} \\
&= -f(\nu_j) \frac{b(\nu_j)b(z_{t+i})^*}{1 - \nu_j z_{t+i}^*} \\
&= -\frac{S(\nu_j)b(z_{t+i})^*}{1 - \nu_j z_{t+i}^*}, \\
[R_{22} + Q_2 K^{-1} Q_2^*]_{ji} &= \frac{1 - f_j f_i^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*} + \frac{f_j f_i^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*} = \frac{1}{1 - w_j w_i^*}, \\
[R_{32} + Q_3 K^{-1} Q_2^*]_{ji} &= \frac{1 - f(\nu_j) f_i^*}{1 - \nu_j w_i^*} + \frac{f(\nu_j) f_i^*}{1 - \nu_j w_i^*} = \frac{1}{1 - \nu_j w_i^*}, \\
[R_{33} + Q_3 K^{-1} Q_3^*]_{ji} &= \frac{1 - f(\nu_j) f(\nu_i)^*}{1 - \nu_j \nu_i^*} + f(\nu_j) f(\nu_i)^* \frac{1 - b(\nu_j)b(\nu_i)^*}{1 - \nu_j \nu_i^*} \\
&= \frac{1 - S(\nu_j)S(\nu_i)^*}{1 - \nu_j \nu_i^*}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the obtained Schur complement  $[R_{i,j} + Q_i K^{-1} Q_j^*]_{i,j=1}^3$ , we let  $\nu_j \rightarrow w_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, t$ )

and then pre- and post-multiply by the matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} b(\mathcal{Z}_2)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{2t} \end{bmatrix}$  and by its adjoint, respectively, resulting in the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} -K_{11} & 0 & K_{31}^* \\ 0 & K_{22} & K_{22} \\ K_{31} & K_{22} & \left[ \frac{1 - S(w_j)S(w_i)^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^t \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.26)$$

where

$$K_{11} = \left[ \frac{1}{1 - z_{t+j} z_{t+i}^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^{\ell-t}, \quad K_{22} = \left[ \frac{1}{1 - w_j w_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^t, \quad K_{31} = \left[ -\frac{S(w_j)}{1 - w_j z_{t+i}^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^{t, \ell-t}. \quad (3.27)$$

Note that the  $j$ -th row  $[K_{31}]_j$  of  $K_{31}$  can be written in the form

$$[K_{31}]_j = S(w_j) G_{\ell-t}^* (I - w_j D(\mathcal{Z}_2)^*)^{-1} \quad (j = 1, \dots, t).$$

Using Lemma 2.2, in view of the reductions made so far from  $P$  to  $P_5$ , to prove that  $\text{sq}_- P \geq N - \ell$ , we only have to show that the Schur complement  $\mathbf{S}$  to the block  $\begin{bmatrix} -K_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & K_{22} \end{bmatrix}$  in (3.26) has at least  $t$  negative eigenvalues, i.e., is negative definite. This Schur complement is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S} &= \left[ \frac{1 - S(w_j)S(w_i)^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^t + K_{31} K_{11}^{-1} K_{31}^* - K_{22} \\ &= - \left[ \frac{S(w_j)S(w_i)^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^t + K_{31} K_{11}^{-1} K_{31}^* \\ &= - \left[ \frac{S(w_j)S(w_i)^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*} - [K_{31}]_j K_{11}^{-1} ([K_{31}]_i)^* \right]_{j,i=1}^t \\ &= - \left[ \frac{S(w_j)S(w_i)^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - S(w_j) G_{\ell-t} (I - w_j D(\mathcal{Z}_2)^*)^{-1} K_{11}^{-1} (I - w_i^* D(\mathcal{Z}_2))^{-1} G_{\ell-t}^* S(w_i)^* \right]_{j,i=1}^t \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

Introduce the rational function

$$\vartheta(z) = 1 + (z - 1) G_{\ell-t}^* (I - z D(\mathcal{Z}_2)^*)^{-1} K_{11}^{-1} (I - D(\mathcal{Z}_2))^{-1} G_{\ell-t}. \quad (3.29)$$

and note that  $K_{11}$  satisfies the Stein equation

$$K_{11} - D(\mathcal{Z}_2) K_{11} D(\mathcal{Z}_2)^* = G_{\ell-t} G_{\ell-t}^*.$$

Upon setting  $k = \ell - t$  and  $r_1 = \dots = r_k = 1$  and picking points  $z_{t+1}, \dots, z_\ell$  instead of  $w_1, \dots, w_k$  in Lemma 3.2, we get  $A = D(\mathcal{Z}_2)$ ,  $K = K_{11}$ ,  $E = G_{\ell-t}$  and thus, by Lemma 3.2, we conclude that

$$\vartheta(z) = e^{i\alpha} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell-t} \frac{z - z_{t+j}}{1 - z z_{t+j}^*}, \quad (3.30)$$

where  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  is chosen to provide the normalization  $\vartheta(1) = 1$ , and moreover, relation (3.10) in the present setting takes the form

$$1 - \vartheta(z)\vartheta(w)^* = (1 - zw^*)G_{\ell-t}^*(I - zD(\mathcal{Z}_2)^*)^{-1}K_{11}^{-1}(I - w^*D(\mathcal{Z}_2))^{-1}G_{\ell-t}. \quad (3.31)$$

It follows from (3.30) that  $Z(\vartheta) = \mathcal{Z}_2$  (more precisely,  $\vartheta$  is of degree  $\ell - t$  and has simple poles at  $z_{t+1}, \dots, z_\ell$ ). Since  $\mathcal{Z}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}_2 = \emptyset$ , it follows that  $\vartheta(w_j) \neq 0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, t$ . Upon making use of (3.31), we rewrite (3.28) as

$$\mathbf{S} = - \left[ \frac{S(w_j)\vartheta(w_j)\vartheta(w_i)^*S(w_i)^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^t \quad (3.32)$$

and conclude, since  $S(w_j)\vartheta(w_j) \neq 0$  ( $j = 1, \dots, t$ ) that  $\mathbf{S}$  is negative definite. Summarizing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sq}_- P \geq \text{sq}_- P_5 &= \text{sq}_-(-K) + \text{sq}_- \begin{bmatrix} -K_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & K_{22} \end{bmatrix} + \text{sq}_- \mathbf{S} \\ &= (N - 2\ell) + (\ell - t) + t = N - \ell, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Theorems 1.7 and 1.11: proofs

**Proof of Theorem 1.7:** The implication  $\mathbf{3} \Rightarrow \mathbf{1}$  was already proved, and  $\mathbf{1} \Rightarrow \mathbf{3}$  follows from the definition of  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$ .

Assume  $\mathbf{2}$  holds, and let  $\tilde{f}$  be the standard function that extends  $f$  as stated in  $\mathbf{2}$ . By Theorem 1.8  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$ . It is obvious from the definition of  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$  that we have  $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\kappa'}$  for some  $\kappa' \leq \kappa$ . However, Remark 1.10 implies that in fact  $\kappa' = \kappa$ , and  $\mathbf{1}$  follows.

It remains to prove  $\mathbf{3} \Rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ . Assume that  $f$  satisfies  $\mathbf{3}$ . Arguing as in the proof of  $\mathbf{3} \Rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ , we obtain the meromorphic function  $F(z)$  given by (2.16) such that  $F(z) = f(z)$  for  $z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \Lambda)$  (in the notation of the proof of  $\mathbf{3} \Rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ ). By the already proved part of Theorem 1.7, we know that  $f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$ . By the second statement of Lemma 2.3,  $\tilde{F} \in \mathcal{S}_{\kappa'}$  for some  $\kappa' \leq \kappa + n$ , where  $\tilde{F}$  is the restriction of  $F$  to the set  $\mathbb{D} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \Lambda)$ . By continuity (statement 3. of Lemma 2.2), the function  $F$ , considered on its natural

domain of definition  $\mathbb{D} \setminus P(F)$ , where  $P(F)$  is the set of poles of  $F$ , also belongs to  $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa'}$ . Using Theorem 1.4, write  $F = \frac{S}{B}$ , where  $S$  is a Schur function and  $B$  is a Blaschke product of degree  $\kappa'$  without common zeros. Thus,  $f$  admits an extension to a standard function  $\tilde{f}$  with  $\kappa'$  poles and  $\rho$  jumps, for some nonnegative integer  $\rho$ . By Theorem 1.8 and Remark 1.10 we have

$$\mathbf{k}_m(f) = \kappa' + \rho, \quad \text{for every } m \geq \kappa' + 2\rho. \quad (4.1)$$

On the other hand, since  $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\kappa}$ , we have  $\mathbf{k}_n(f) = \kappa$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ . Comparing with (4.1), we see that  $\kappa' + \rho = \kappa$ , and **2** follows.

**Proof of Theorem 1.11:** If  $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\kappa}$ , and  $\tilde{f}$  is the standard function that extends  $f$  (as in statement **2** of Theorem 1.7), then by Theorem 1.8

$$N(f) \leq N(\tilde{f}) \leq 2\kappa.$$

If  $\mathbf{k}_{2\kappa}(f) = \mathbf{k}_{2\kappa+3}(f) = \kappa$ , then obviously **3** of Theorem 1.7 holds, and  $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\kappa}$  by Theorem 1.7.

## 5 A local result

Let  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{D}$  be an open set, and let

$$\mathbf{k}_n(f; \Omega) := \max_{z_1, \dots, z_n \in \Omega} \text{sq}_- P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n),$$

where the domain of definition of the function  $f$  contains  $\Omega$ . A known local result (see [4, Theorem 1.1.4], where it is proved in the more general setting of operator valued functions) states that for a meromorphic function  $f$  from the class  $\mathcal{S}_{\kappa}$  and for every open set  $\Omega \in \mathbb{D}$  that does not contain any poles of  $f$ , there is an integer  $n$  such that  $\mathbf{k}_n(f; \Omega) = \kappa$ . However, the minimal such  $n$  can be arbitrarily large, in contrast with Theorem 1.8, as the following example shows.

**Example 5.1** Fix a positive integer  $n$ , and let

$$f_n(z) = \frac{z^n(2-z)}{2z-1} = \frac{S(z)}{b(z)},$$

where  $S(z) = z^n$  is a Schur function, and  $b(z) = \frac{z-1/2}{1-z/2}$  is a Blaschke factor. By Theorem 1.4,  $f_n \in \mathcal{S}_1$ . Thus, the kernel

$$K(z, w) := \frac{1 - f_n(z)f_n(w)^*}{1 - zw^*} = 1 + zw^* + \dots + z^{n-1}(w^*)^{n-1} - \frac{3z^n(w^*)^n}{(2z-1)(2w^*-1)}$$

has one negative square on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ . Select  $n$  distinct points  $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$  (in some order) near zero, and multiply the Pick matrix  $P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n)$  by  $\Phi(\mathcal{Z})$  on the left and by  $\Phi(\mathcal{Z})^*$  on the right, where  $\Phi(\mathcal{Z})$  is defined in (3.2). By Lemma 3.1,

$$\lim_{z_1, \dots, z_n \rightarrow 0} \Phi(\mathcal{Z}) P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n) \Phi(\mathcal{Z})^* = \left[ \frac{1}{i!} \frac{1}{j!} \left( \frac{\partial^{i+j}}{\partial z^i \partial (w^*)^j} K(z, w) \right)_{z, w=0} \right]_{i, j=0}^{n-1}, \quad (5.1)$$

which is the identity matrix. Therefore, by Lemma 2.2 there exists a  $\delta_n > 0$  such that  $P_n(f; z_1, \dots, z_n) \geq 0$  if  $|z_1|, \dots, |z_n| < \delta_n$ .

On the other hand, since

$$\left( \frac{\partial^{2n}}{\partial z^n \partial (w^*)^n} K(z, w) \right)_{z, w=0} = -3,$$

selecting an ordered set of  $n+1$  distinct points  $\mathcal{Z}' = \{z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}\}$  in a neighborhood of zero, analogously to (5.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} \rightarrow 0} \Phi(\mathcal{Z}') P_{n+1}(f; z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) \Phi(\mathcal{Z}')^* &= \left[ \frac{1}{i!} \frac{1}{j!} \left( \frac{\partial^{i+j}}{\partial z^i \partial (w^*)^j} K(z, w) \right)_{z, w=0} \right]_{i, j=0}^n \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & -3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.2 again, there exists a  $\delta'_n > 0$  such that  $P_{n+1}(f; z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})$  has exactly one negative eigenvalue if  $|z_1|, \dots, |z_{n+1}| < \delta'_n$ . (Note that  $P_{n+1}(f; z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})$  cannot have more than one negative eigenvalue because  $f \in \mathcal{S}_1$ .)

Theorem 1.7, or more precisely its proof, allows us to extend the local result to the more general classes  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$ :

**Theorem 5.2** *If  $f \in \mathcal{S}_\kappa$  is defined on  $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a discrete set, then for every open set  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{D} \setminus \Lambda$  there exists a positive integer  $n$  such that*

$$\mathbf{k}_n(f; \Omega) = q + \ell_\Omega, \quad (5.2)$$

where  $\ell_\Omega$  is the number of jump points of  $f$  that belong to  $\Omega$ , and  $q$  is the number of poles of  $f$  in  $\mathbb{D}$ , counted with multiplicities.

Note that in view of **1**  $\Leftrightarrow$  **2** of Theorem 1.7, the right hand side of (5.2) is equal to  $\kappa - \ell_{\mathbb{D} \setminus \Omega}$ , where  $\ell_{\mathbb{D} \setminus \Omega}$  is the number of jump points of  $f$  that do not belong to  $\Omega$ . Therefore, since  $\mathbf{k}_n(f; \Omega)$  is completely independent of the values of  $f$  at jump points outside  $\Omega$ , it is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{k}_m(f; \Omega) \leq q + \ell_\Omega \quad \text{for every integer } m > 0. \quad (5.3)$$



**Proof:** We may assume by Theorem 1.7 that  $f$  is a standard function. We may also assume that  $f$  has no jumps outside  $\Omega$ , because the values of  $f$  at jump points outside  $\Omega$  do not contribute to  $\mathbf{k}_n(f; \Omega)$ .

Let  $w_1, \dots, w_k$  be the distinct poles of  $f$  in  $\Omega$  (if  $f$  has no poles in  $\Omega$ , the subsequent argument is simplified accordingly), of orders  $r_1, \dots, r_k$ , respectively, and let  $z_1, \dots, z_\ell$  be the jumps of  $f$ . Then analogously to (3.12) we have

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{\widehat{S}(z)}{b(z)} & \text{if } z \notin \{z_1, \dots, z_\ell, w_{t+1}, \dots, w_k\} \\ f_j & \text{if } z = z_j, j = 1, \dots, \ell \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

where  $b(z)$  is the Blaschke product having zeros  $w_1, \dots, w_k$  of orders  $r_1, \dots, r_k$ , respectively, given by (3.8). We assume that  $w_j = z_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, t$ ,  $\{w_{t+1}, \dots, w_k\} \cap \{z_{t+1}, \dots, z_\ell\} = \emptyset$ , and  $\widehat{S}(z_j)/b(z_j) \neq f_j$  for  $j = t+1, \dots, \ell$ . The function  $\widehat{S}(z)$  is of the form  $\widehat{S}(z) = S(z)/b_{\text{out}}(z)$ , where  $S(z)$  is a Schur function that does not vanish at  $w_1, \dots, w_k$ , and  $b_{\text{out}}(z)$  is the Blaschke product whose zeros coincide with the poles of  $f$  outside  $\Omega$ , with matched orders. Let  $N = 2\ell + \sum_{j=1}^k r_j$ , and select  $N$  distinct points as in (3.13), with the additional proviso that all these points belong to  $\Omega$ . Select also  $n$  distinct points  $\Xi = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\}$ ,  $\xi_j \in \Omega$ , disjoint from (3.13), in a vicinity of some  $z_0 \in \Omega$ ; we assume that  $f$  is analytic at  $z_0$ . The number  $n$  of points  $\xi_j$ , and further specifications concerning the set  $\Xi$ , will be determined later.

Let

$$P = P_{N+n}(f; \mu_{j,i}, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_\ell, z_1, \dots, z_\ell, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n).$$

We now repeat the steps between (3.13) and (3.26) of the proof of Theorem 1.8, applied to the top left  $N \times N$  corner of  $P$ . As a result, we obtain the following matrix:

$$P_6 = \begin{bmatrix} -K_{11} & 0 & K_{31}^* & K_{41}^* \\ 0 & K_{22} & K_{22} & K_{42}^* \\ K_{31} & K_{22} & K_{33} & K_{43}^* \\ K_{41} & K_{42} & K_{43} & K_{44} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.5)$$

where  $K_{11}$ ,  $K_{22}$ , and  $K_{31}$  are as in (3.27), and

$$\begin{aligned} K_{41} &= \left[ -\frac{\widehat{S}(\xi_j)}{1 - \xi_j z_{t+i}^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^{n, \ell-t}, & K_{42} &= \left[ \frac{1}{1 - \xi_j w_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^{n, \ell-t}, \\ K_{43} &= \left[ \frac{1 - \widehat{S}(\xi_j) \widehat{S}(w_i)^*}{1 - \xi_j w_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^{n, \ell-t}, & K_{44} &= \left[ \frac{1 - \widehat{S}(\xi_j) \widehat{S}(\xi_i)^*}{1 - \xi_j \xi_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^n, \\ K_{33} &= \left[ \frac{1 - \widehat{S}(w_j) \widehat{S}(w_i)^*}{1 - w_j w_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^t. \end{aligned}$$

The sizes of matrices  $K_{11}$ ,  $K_{22}$ ,  $K_{33}$ , and  $K_{44}$  are  $(\ell - t) \times (\ell - t)$ ,  $t \times t$ ,  $t \times t$ , and  $n \times n$ , respectively. It follows that

$$\text{sq}_-P \geq N - 2\ell + \text{sq}_-P_6 = \sum_{j=1}^k r_j + \text{sq}_-P_6. \quad (5.6)$$

Take the Schur complement  $\mathbf{S}$  to the block  $\begin{bmatrix} -K_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & K_{22} \end{bmatrix}$  in (5.5):

$$\mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{11} & \mathbf{S}_{12} \\ \mathbf{S}_{21} & \mathbf{S}_{22} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}_{22} = K_{44} - K_{42}K_{22}^{-1}K_{42}^* + K_{41}K_{11}^{-1}K_{41}^*.$$

We have

$$\text{sq}_-P_6 = \ell - t + \text{sq}_-\mathbf{S}. \quad (5.7)$$

Analogously to formulas (3.28) and (3.32) we obtain

$$\mathbf{S}_{11} = - \left[ \frac{\widehat{S}(w_j)\vartheta(w_j)\vartheta(w_i)^*\widehat{S}(w_i)^*}{1 - w_jw_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^t, \quad \mathbf{S}_{21} = - \left[ \frac{\widehat{S}(\xi_j)\vartheta(\xi_j)\vartheta(w_i)^*\widehat{S}(w_i)^*}{1 - \xi_jw_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^{t,n}, \quad (5.8)$$

where the rational function  $\vartheta$  is given by (3.29). Note that  $\widehat{S}(w_i)\vartheta(w_i) \neq 0$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, t$ . Multiply  $\mathbf{S}$  by the matrix

$$\text{diag} \left( \frac{1}{\widehat{S}(w_1)\vartheta(w_1)}, \dots, \frac{1}{\widehat{S}(w_t)\vartheta(w_t)}, I \right) \quad (5.9)$$

on the left and by the adjoint of (5.9) on the right. We arrive at

$$P_7 = \begin{bmatrix} - \left[ \frac{1}{1 - w_jw_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^t & \left( - \left[ \frac{\widehat{S}(\xi_j)\vartheta(\xi_j)}{1 - \xi_jw_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^{n,t} \right)^* \\ - \left[ \frac{\widehat{S}(\xi_j)\vartheta(\xi_j)}{1 - \xi_jw_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^{n,t} & K_{44} - K_{42}K_{22}^{-1}K_{42}^* + K_{41}K_{11}^{-1}K_{41}^* \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.10)$$

Finally, we take the Schur complement, denoted  $P_8$ , to the block  $- \left[ \frac{1}{1 - w_jw_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^t$  of  $P_7$ . Then

$$\text{sq}_-\mathbf{S} = t + \text{sq}_-P_8. \quad (5.11)$$

The  $(j, i)$  entry of  $P_8$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 - \widehat{S}(\xi_j)\widehat{S}(\xi_i)^*}{1 - \xi_j\xi_i^*} - G_{\ell-t}^*(I - \xi_j D(\mathcal{W}_1)^*)^{-1}K_{22}^{-1}(I - \xi_i^* D(\mathcal{W}_1))^{-1}G_{\ell-t} \\ & + \widehat{S}(\xi_j)G_{\ell-t}^*(I - \xi_j D(\mathcal{Z}_2)^*)^{-1}K_{11}^{-1}(I - \xi_i^* D(\mathcal{Z}_2))^{-1}G_{\ell-t}\widehat{S}(\xi_i)^* \\ & + \widehat{S}(\xi_j)\vartheta(\xi_j)G_{\ell-t}^*(I - \xi_j D(\mathcal{W}_1)^*)^{-1}K_{22}^{-1}(I - \xi_i^* D(\mathcal{W}_1))^{-1}G_{\ell-t}\vartheta(\xi_i)^*\widehat{S}(\xi_i)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$K_{22} - D(\mathcal{W}_1)K_{22}D(\mathcal{W}_1)^* = G_{\ell-t}G_{\ell-t}^*,$$

we conclude (as it was done for the function  $\vartheta$  given in (3.29)) that the rational function

$$\widehat{\vartheta}(z) = 1 + (z - 1)G_{\ell-t}^*(I - zD(\mathcal{W}_1)^*)^{-1}K_{22}^{-1}(I - D(\mathcal{W}_1))^{-1}G_{\ell-t}$$

is inner, and its set of zeros is  $Z(\widehat{\vartheta}) = \mathcal{W}_1$ . Using (3.31) and the formula

$$1 - \widehat{\vartheta}(z)\widehat{\vartheta}(w)^* = G_{\ell-t}^*(I - zD(\mathcal{W}_1)^*)^{-1}K_{22}^{-1}(I - w^*D(\mathcal{W}_1))^{-1}G_{\ell-t}$$

similar to (3.31), the expression for the  $(j, i)$  entry of  $P_8$  takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 - \widehat{S}(\xi_j)\widehat{S}(\xi_i)^*}{1 - \xi_j\xi_i^*} - \frac{1 - \widehat{\vartheta}(\xi_j)\widehat{\vartheta}(\xi_i)^*}{1 - \xi_j\xi_i^*} + \widehat{S}(\xi_j)\frac{1 - \vartheta(\xi_j)\vartheta(\xi_i)^*}{1 - \xi_j\xi_i^*}\widehat{S}(\xi_i)^* \\ & + \widehat{S}(\xi_j)\vartheta(\xi_j)\frac{1 - \widehat{\vartheta}(\xi_j)\widehat{\vartheta}(\xi_i)^*}{1 - \xi_j\xi_i^*}\vartheta(\xi_i)^*\widehat{S}(\xi_i)^* \\ & = \widehat{\vartheta}(\xi_j)\frac{1 - \widehat{S}(\xi_j)\vartheta(\xi_j)\vartheta(\xi_i)^*\widehat{S}(\xi_i)^*}{1 - \xi_j\xi_i^*}\widehat{\vartheta}(\xi_i)^*. \end{aligned}$$

We now assume that the point  $z_0 \in \Omega$  in a neighborhood of which the set  $\Xi$  is selected is such that  $\widehat{\vartheta}(z_0) \neq 0$ . Then we may assume that  $\widehat{\vartheta}(\xi_j) \neq 0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Multiply  $P_8$  on the left by the matrix  $\text{diag}(\widehat{\vartheta}(\xi_1)^{-1}, \dots, \widehat{\vartheta}(\xi_n)^{-1})$  and on the right by its adjoint of, resulting in a matrix

$$P_9 = \left[ \frac{1 - T(\xi_j)T(\xi_i)^*}{1 - \xi_j\xi_i^*} \right]_{j,i=1}^n,$$

where the function  $T(z)$  is given by  $T(z) = \widehat{S}(z)\vartheta(z)$ . We have

$$\text{sq}_-P_8 = \text{sq}_-P_9 \tag{5.12}$$

Note that  $T(z)$  is a meromorphic function with no poles in  $\Omega$ . By [4, Theorem 1.1.4], there exist a positive integer  $n$  and points  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$  in a neighborhood of  $z_0$  such that  $P_9$  has  $q - \sum_{j=1}^k r_j$  (the number of poles of  $T(z)$ ) negative eigenvalues. Using this choice of  $\xi_j$ , and combining (5.6), (5.7), (5.11), and (5.12), we obtain

$$\text{sq}_-P \geq q + \ell.$$

Now equality (5.2) follows in view of (5.3).  $\square$

## 6 An open problem

Fix an integer  $k \geq 3$ . An open set  $D \subseteq \mathbb{D}$  is said to have the  $k$ -th Hindmarsh property if every function  $f$  defined on  $D$  and such that the matrices  $P_k(f; z_1, \dots, z_k)$  are positive semidefinite for every  $k$ -tuple of points  $z_1, \dots, z_k \in D$ , admits a (necessarily unique) extension to a Schur function (defined on  $\mathbb{D}$ ). Theorem 1.1 shows that  $\mathbb{D}$  has the 3-rd Hindmarsh property. Example 5.1 shows that the open disk of radius  $\delta_n$  centered at the origin does not have the  $n$ -th Hindmarsh property, if  $\delta_n$  is sufficiently small.

Denote by  $\mathcal{H}_k$  the collection of all sets with the  $k$ -th Hindmarsh property. Clearly,

$$\mathcal{H}_3 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_4 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{H}_k \subseteq \dots$$

**Proposition 6.1** *Let  $D \in \mathcal{H}_k$ . If  $\mathcal{Z} \subset D$  is a discrete set in  $D$ , then  $D \setminus \mathcal{Z}$  also has the  $k$ -th Hindmarsh property.*

**Proof.** Let  $f$  be a function with the domain of definition  $D \setminus \mathcal{Z}$  and such that  $P_k(f; z_1, \dots, z_k) \geq 0$  for every set of distinct points  $z_1, \dots, z_k \in D \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ . In particular,  $P_3(f; z_1, z_2, z_3) \geq 0$  for every triple of distinct points  $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in D \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ . By Hindmarsh's theorem,  $f$  is analytic on  $D \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ . Also,

$$|f(z)|^2 = (|f(z)|^2 - 1) + 1 = -P_1(f; z)(1 - |z|^2) + 1 \leq 1$$

for every  $z \in D \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ . Thus,  $f$  admits an analytic continuation to a function  $\hat{f}$  on  $D$ . By continuity,  $P_k(\hat{f}; z_1, \dots, z_k) \geq 0$  for every  $k$ -tuple of distinct points  $z_1, \dots, z_k \in D$ . Since  $D \in \mathcal{H}_k$ ,  $\hat{f}$  admits an extension to a Schur function.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.2** *Let  $D_0 = \mathbb{D}$ ,  $D_j = D_{j-1} \setminus \mathcal{Z}_{j-1}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $\mathcal{Z}_{j-1}$  is a discrete set in  $D_{j-1}$ . Then all the sets  $D_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , have the 3-rd Hindmarsh property.*

Using the sets with the Hindmarsh property, the implication **3.**  $\Rightarrow$  **1.** of Theorem 1.7 can be extended to a larger class of functions, as follows:

**Theorem 6.3** *Let  $f$  be defined on  $D$ , where  $D \in \mathcal{H}_p$ . Then  $f$  belongs to  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa(D)$  if and only if*

$$\mathbf{k}_n(f) = \mathbf{k}_{n+p}(f) = \kappa \tag{6.1}$$

for some integer  $n$ .

The definition of  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa(D)$  is the same as  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$ , with the only difference being that  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa(D)$  consists of functions defined on  $D$ . The proof of Theorem 6.3 is essentially the same as that of **3.**  $\Rightarrow$  **1.** of Theorem 1.7.

**Problem 6.4** *Describe the structure of sets with the  $k$ -th Hindmarsh property.*

In the general case this seems to be a very difficult unsolved problem. We do not address this problem in the present paper.

**Acknowledgement.** The research of LR was supported in part by an NSF grant.

## References

- [1] V. M. Adamyan, D. Z. Arov, and M. G. Kreĭn. *Analytic properties of the Schmidt pairs of a Hankel operator and the generalized Schur-Takagi problem*, (Russian) Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **86(128)** (1971), 34–75.
- [2] J. Agler and N. J. Young. *Functions that are almost multipliers of Hilbert function spaces*, Proc. of London Math. Soc., **76** (1998), 453–475.
- [3] N. I. Akhiezer. *On a minimum problem in function theory and the number of roots of an algebraic equation inside the unit disc*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Mat. Estestv. Nauk **9** (1930), 1169–1189, English transl. in: *Topics in interpolation theory*, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., **95**, 19–35.
- [4] D. Alpay, A. Dijksma, J. Rovnyak, and H. de Snoo. *Schur functions, operator colligations and reproducing kernel Pontryagin spaces*, OT96, Birkhäuser, 1997.
- [5] N. Aronszajn. *Theory of reproducing kernels*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **68** (1950), 337–404.
- [6] J. A. Ball, I. Gohberg, and L. Rodman. *Interpolation of rational matrix functions*, OT45, Birkhäuser Verlag, 1990.
- [7] J. A. Ball and J. W. Helton. *Interpolation problems of Pick–Hevanlinna and Loewner type for meromorphic matrix functions: parametrizations of the set of all solutions*, Integral Equations and Operator Theory **9** (1986), 155–203.
- [8] R. Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*, Springer–Verlag, New York, 1996.
- [9] V. Bolotnikov and L. Rodman. *Krein–Langer factorizations via pole triples*, Integral Equations and Operator Theory, to appear.
- [10] A. Dijksma, H. Langer, and H. S. de Snoo. *Characteristic functions of unitary operator colligations in  $\Pi_\kappa$  spaces*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, **19** (1986), 125–194.

- [11] W. F. Donoghue, Jr. *Monotone matrix functions and analytic continuation*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1974.
- [12] L. B. Golinskii. *A generalization of the matrix Nevanlinna-Pick problem*, Izv. Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Ser. Mat. **18** (1983), 187–205. (Russian).
- [13] A. Hindmarsh. *Pick conditions and analyticity*, Pacific J. Math. **27** (1968), 527–531.
- [14] M. G. Kreĭn and H. Langer. *Über die verallgemeinerten Resolventen und die charakteristische Funktion eines isometrischen Operators im Raume  $\Pi_\kappa$* , Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai **5** (1972), 353–399.
- [15] P. Lancaster and M. Tismenetsky. *The theory of matrices with applications*, 2nd Edition, Academic Press, 1985.
- [16] A. A. Nudelman. *A generalization of classical interpolation problems*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR **4** (1981), 790–793. (Russian).

Department of Mathematics  
P. O. Box 8795  
The College of William and Mary  
Williamsburg VA 23187-8795, USA  
vladi@math.wm.edu, sykhei@wm.edu,  
lxrodm@math.wm.edu